

contemporary art student by making it the history of methods of art.

Mrs. Vera MYHRE (Denmark) concluded the discussion by describing the work of the Academy in Copenhagen, where each professor gave individual training without following a fixed plan. In a two-year curriculum there were three directions, comprising lectures, individual practice and group practice; the choice of themes for study arose out of the problems of the individual student and led into a common fundamental discussion. Group work included co-operation with ethnographers and there were projects for the formation of a film academy.

SESSION 6

The Place of Art History

THE Chairman, Mr. KESTELMAN, opening the sixth session on 12 June, said that the section concerning the place of Art History and other intellectual disciplines in the art school would form the subject of discussion, with the further aspect regarding the way in which these were to be related to creative work in the studio. He pointed out that the Conference was not attempting to come to conclusions but that delegates might usefully consider further steps.

He said that Mr. Lardera had asked him to put forward a suggestion of an alternative way of training, at any rate, some students. Mr. Lardera, who is generally sceptical of the value of schools of art, in accepting a professorship at Hamburg, had suggested that students should help him in carrying out a public commission, which was in fact accomplished; he felt that this was a more direct and fruitful way and one which linked up with Renaissance practice.

Mr. M. DE SAUSMAREZ (U.K.) referred to a danger inherent in liberal education in British art schools: if the sights were set too high, the standard of entry might become too exacting, so that it would become difficult for a strong artistic talent, which was characterised by its single-mindedness, and this before all else must be respected. "*The strongest talent,*" he said, "*wilts or goes into open rebellion by being kept too long from its appointed field of concentrated study.*" He also criticised systematic liberalisation:

"No one will quarrel with the idea that the young artist needs to see his studies related to the wider issues or the context of the society and culture of which he is part, but I doubt very much if the best way to achieve this is by imposing a super-structure of dictated and systematised liberalisation." "The fact of the matter is that apart from the history of art which most certainly should be taught by qualified art historians, we might be in danger of permitting others—philosophers, psychologists, sociologists—who represent the image of liberalism, to maintain the integrity of their own disciplines by trying to make the sort of demands on art students that would be more appropriate to a university general arts degree." "But I think this is a problem we are very much in need of facing and very concerned about." "I hope if there are to be any resolutions from this conference, that one at any rate of these could deal with this problem."

Professor ROGERS, speaking as Chairman of the Fine Art Panel of the Summer-son Committee, pointed out some good reasons for raising the educational requirements and drew attention to the escape clause for the really talented students.

Mr. DE SAUSMAREZ said that the disparity between the fifty per cent of the whole entry to the School of Painting of the Royal College of Art which did not